

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Vignia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/767,546	01/23/2001	Pradeep K. Subrahmanyan	S01.12-0644	3008
75	590 06/30/2003			
Westman Champlin & Kelly			EXAMINER	
•	rnational Centre	•	SNIEZEK, ANDREW L	
Minneapolis, MN 55402-3319		·	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2651	Ż
			DATE MAILED: 06/30/2003	10

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

,	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Advisory Action	09/767,546	SUBRAHMANYAN, PRADEEP K.
•	Examiner	Art Unit
	Andrew L. Sniezek	2651
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address
THE REPLY FILED 16 June 2002 FAILS TO PLACE TH Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avifinal rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this application application (ation. A proper reply to a
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]	
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Officed may reply accepted activation to the mailing that th	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth later than SIX MONTHS from the mailin FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE date on which the petition under 37 CF of extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply ce later than three months after the mai	g date of the final rejection. IE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP R 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension on the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action; or
 1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF). 	Brief must be filed within the pe	
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:	
(a) _ they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	pelow);	
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or simplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cancel	ng a corresponding number of f	inally rejected claims.
NOTE:		
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) 35 would be canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	allowable if submitted in a separ	rate, timely filed amendment
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request for application in condition for allowance because: See		idered but does NOT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered bec raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY t	to issues which were newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we		
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		
Claim(s) allowed: 35.		
Claim(s) objected to:		
Claim(s) rejected: 1-34 and 36.		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is	a) approved or b) disapp	proved by the Examiner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	.
10. Other:		Andrew L. Sniezek Primary Examiner Art Unit: 2651

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office



Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: applicant states the specification states that an "adaptive controller adapts its controller parameters in real time" and that the references do not teach a controller block with an additional input for parameters for use by the controller itself in real time. The claims do not set forth an "adaptive controller" as stated, only an apparatus that adaptively generates. The controller as used in the prior art does operate in real time. The examiner does not see any where in the references that they do not operate in real time or are directed to non-adaptive controllers as stated by applicant. Also, the argument directed to an "additional input" can not be reconciled with the claims..